

REMARKS**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brems et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,566,272) (hereinafter "Brems") in view of Waldman (U.S. Patent No. 5,157,719) (hereinafter "Waldman").

Claims 2, 9, 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brems in view of Waldman, and further in view of what the Office Action refers to as "applicant's admitted prior art" (hereinafter "AAPA").

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brems in view of Waldman, and further in view of Baker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,539,098) (hereinafter "Baker") and further in view of AAPA.

Claims 4-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brems in view of Waldman, and further in view of Attwater et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,940,793) (hereinafter "Attwater").

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brems in view of Waldman, further in view of Attwater, and in further view of AAPA.

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brems in view of Waldman, in view of Attwater, in view of AAPA and in further view of Baker.

Claims 12-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brems in view of Waldman, in view of AAPA, and further in view of Attwater.

Claims 14 and 15 allegedly "contain subject matter similar to Claims 2, 12 and 13, and thus are rejected for the same reasons."

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant has canceled claims 1-3 without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicant has amended claims 4, 8 and 9 to differently describe embodiments of the disclosure of the instant application and/or to improve their form. Accordingly, claims 4-15 remain pending for consideration.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brems in view of Waldman. Claims 2, 9, 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brems in view of Waldman, and further in view of AAPA. Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brems in view of Waldman, and further in view of Baker and further in view of AAPA. Claims 4-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brems in view of Waldman, and further in view of Attwater. Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brems in view of Waldman, further in view of Attwater, and in further view of AAPA. Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brems in view of Waldman, in view of Attwater, in view of AAPA and in further view of Baker. Claims 12-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brems in view of Waldman, in view of AAPA, and further in view of Attwater. Claims 14 and 15 allegedly “contain subject matter similar to Claims 2, 12 and 13, and thus are rejected for the same reasons.”

Applicant has canceled claims 1-3 without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering the rejections of these claims moot. Withdrawal of the rejections of these claims is thus respectfully

requested. Applicant has amended independent claims 4 and 8 to differently describe embodiments of the disclosure of the instant application. To the extent that these rejections might be deemed to still apply to the claims as newly-amended, they are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

At page 8 of the Office Action, with regard to the rejection of independent claim 4, the Examiner concedes that “Brems in view of Waldman does not teach the use of three dictionaries for dividing a sequence of numbers and the associated recognition process utilizing the dictionaries.” However, the Examiner then goes on to apply Attwater as allegedly curing these deficiencies for reasons set forth at page 8 of the Office Action. Such interpretations of Attwater are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Applicant respectfully submits that Attwater does not teach, or even suggest, at least the features of independent claim 4 of “unless the third region is successfully recognized...” and “unless the second and third regions are recognized...” Accordingly, similar features in these regards have now been added to the other remaining independent claim 8.

Applicant notes that there are significant differences between the applied Attwater reference and the claimed features of embodiments of the instant application that the Office Action alleges are met by Attwater. For example, an important feature of embodiments of the instant application is that numbers or a sequence of numbers input at once are divided into plural areas by the apparatus/methodology. The first, second and third areas are analyzed and recognized in this order. When a determination is made that recognition of a certain area is not possible, a dictionary for that certain area and dictionaries for subsequent areas are prepared and then the recognition is continued.

Applicant respectfully submits that Attwater is entirely silent on Applicant's claimed feature of dividing an input data string using dictionaries into plural areas, each of which has a certain meaning. Applicant notes that the disclosure of Attwater is based on a premise that separate information are sequentially input. Accordingly, Attwater cannot attend to a situation where separate information are input at once because it cannot divide the input information into plural meaningful areas. As a result, it is clear that Attwater does not cure the deficiencies of Brems and Waldman in the manner asserted at pages 8-9 of the Office Action.

Nevertheless, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant has opted to further amend each of independent claims 4 and 8 in order to even further clarify these advantageous features of embodiments of the instant application by specifically describing analyzing the sequence of numbers received as pronounced speech, while dividing the sequence of numbers into first, second and third regions different in meaning from each other, with reference to the first, second and third dictionaries to determine the successful recognition of the first, second and third region in order.

Applicant respectfully submits that Attwater does not teach, or even suggest, these features of newly-amended independent claims 4 and 8 of the instant application.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn because none of Brems, Waldman, nor Attwater, whether taken singly or combined, teach or suggest each feature of independent claims 4 and 8, as amended. MPEP § 2143.03 instructs that "[t]o establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 409 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974)." Furthermore, Applicant respectfully asserts that the dependent

claims are allowable at least because of their dependence from claim 4 or 8, and the reasons set forth above. Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that the additionally applied reference to Baker, with respect to claims 3 and 7, does not cure the deficiencies discussed above with regard to Brems and Waldman.

The Office Action notes, at pages 2-3, section 4, that Applicant has not “officially challenged the official notice taken with respect to Claims 2-3 and 9-15.” Applicant has canceled claims 1-3 without prejudice or disclaimer. With regard to claims 9-15, Applicant respectfully submits that at least the features described in claims 10 and 11 should not be considered as prior art in the instant application. Applicant thus respectfully traverses the Office Action’s assertion of official notice for claims 10 and 11 because the features of these claims are not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art. Accordingly, to the extent that the Examiner might maintain this official notice assertion in the next Office Communication, the Examiner is respectfully requested to provide documentary evidence of this assertion, as required by MPEP § 2144.03. This portion of the MPEP states that “[i]f applicant adequately traverses the examiner’s assertion of official notice, the examiner must provide documentary evidence in the next Office Action if the rejection is to be maintained.”

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the entry of the Amendment to place the application in clear condition for allowance or, in the alternative, in better form for appeal. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after

consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution. A favorable action is awaited.

EXCEPT for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0573. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP



By:

Paul A. Fournier
Reg. No. 41,023

Dated: November 7, 2006

Customer No. 55694
DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005-1209
Tel.: (202) 842-8800
Fax: (202) 842-8465